

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03695 01 OF 03 111535Z

41/11

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 USIE-00 SSO-00 INRE-00 NSCE-00

ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 (ISO) W

----- 023357

O R 111007Z JUL 75

FM USMISSIN NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2665

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 3695

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: AIR MANPOWER: SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS

REFS: A. USNATO 6794 DTG 051730Z DEC 75

B. STATE 263866, NOV 30, 1974;

C. USNATO 0686 DTG 072015Z FEB 75

1. THEE FOLLOWS THE TEXT OF AN MBFR STAFF GROUP DRAFT ENTITLED "SUB-CEILINGS WITHIN A COMBINED AIR/GROUND COMMON CEILING." THE STAFF GROU

P

PREPARED THIS DRAFT FOR THE WG AT THE INSISTENCE OF THE UK REP GERAHTY).

2. THIS DRAFT CONSIDERS THE SAME FOUR APPROACHES TO SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS AS THE PREVIOUS PAPER ISSUED IN DECEMBER 1974 (REF A):

A. APPROACH: SPECIFIES NO SERVICE (MANPOWER) SUB-CEILINGS;

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03695 01 OF 03 111535Z

B. APPROACH2: SPECIFIES SUB-CEILINGS ON AIR AND GROUND MANPOER;

C. APPROACH 3: SPECIFIES SUB-CEILINGS ON GROUND MANPOWER ONLY; AND

D. APPROACH4: SPECIFIES SUB-CEILINGS ON AIR MANPOWER ONLY.

3. THE STAFF GROUP POINTS OUT THAT APPROACHES 1 AND 4 WOULD NOT NECESSARILY PRECLUDE REINSTATEMENT OF GROUND FORCE RECUTIONS AT THE EXPENSE OF AIR, UNLESS THEY WERE FURTHER CAVEATED. THE STAFF GROUP DRAFT EXPRESSES A PREFERENCE, ON MILITARY/TECHNICAL GROUNDDS, FOR APPROACHES 2 OR 3 WHICH WOULD IMPOSE A LIMITATION ON PHASE II RESIDUAL GROUND MANPOWER LEVELS, BUT FINDS LITTLE DIFFERENCE IN THE MILITARY ADVANTAGE THAT MIGHT ACCRUE TO NATO FROM ONE OR THE OTHER OF THESE TWO APPROACHES.

4. THE STAFF GROUP DRAFT ALSO MENTIONS THE US PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH SUB-CEILINGS ON BOTH AIR AND GROUND MANPOWER WITH A LIMITED FREEDOM TO MIX (SUB-SECTION II.B.2 OF REF B), BUT POINTS OUT THAT THE WG WILL NEED TO STUDY THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE US PROPOSAL IN FURTHER DETAIL.

5. BEGIN TEXT

ENCLOSURE

SUB-CEILINGS WITHIN A COMBINED AIR/GROUND COMMON CEILING
NOTE BY THE STAFF GROUP

1. THE MBFR WORKING GROUP HAVE PREVIOUSLY EXAMINED THE MILITARY/TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS OF POSSIBLE APPROACHES FOR THE INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN A COMMON CEILING WITHOUT ADDRESSING AIR MANPOWER FOR REDUCTIONS(1) IN THAT EXAMINATION, FOUR POSSIBLE APPROACHES WHICH EMBRACE AIR AND GROUND MANPOWER IN A COMMON CEILING WERE ENVISAGED, AND WHICH VARY ONLY AS TO THE SPECIFICATION OF AGGREGATE SERVICE SUBJ

-
CEILING, IF ANY. THOSE APPROACHES ARE:

A. APPROACH 1: SPECIFIES NO SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS.

B. APPROACH 2: SPECIFIES SUB-CEILING ON AIR AND GROUND MANPOWER.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03695 01 OF 03 111535Z

C. APPROACH3: SPECIFIES A SUB-CEILING ON GROUND MANPOWER ONLY.

D. APPROACH 4: SPECIFIES A SUB-CEILING ON AIR MANPOWER ONLY.

2. IN EXAMINING THESE APPROACHES THE WORKING GROUP FOUND THAT (2):

A. THERE ARE AT LEAST TWO METHODS FOR INCLUDING AIR MANPOWER IN A COMMON CEILING, WITHOUT ADVERSE MILITARY SECURITY EFFECTS FOR NATO.

APPROACHES 2-3 ARE WHOLLY COMPATIBLE WITH ALLIED FOCUS ON ACHIEVEMENT OF ASYMMETRIC REDUCTIONS IN GROUND FORCES LEADING TO A COMMON CEILING IN THE NGA AND HAVE NO ADVERSE MILITARY SECURITY EFFECTS FOR NATO.

BEGIN FOOTNOTES

(1) AC/276-D(74)14(USNATO 6794 DTG 051730Z DEC 75)

(2) PARA 18, AC/276-D(74)14

END FOOTNOTES

B. APPROACHED 1 AND 4 MIGHT NOT BE COMPATIBLE WITH THIS ALLIED FOCUS, SINCE TECHNICALLY THEY WOULD NOT PRECLUDE REINSTATEMENT OF GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS AT THE EXPENSE OF AIR, UNLESS SOME TYPE MEASURE (I.E. NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE) CAN BE DEVISED TO COMPLEMENT THESE APPROACHES WHICH WOULD PRECLUDE REINSTATEMENT OF SUCH REDUCTIONS. FUTHER EXAMINATION OF SUCH A MEASURE WOULD BE REQUIRED TO ASSESS THE MILITARY/TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE EFFECTS OF THESE APPROACHES ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF ASYMMETRIC REDUCTIONS IN GROUND FORCE LEADING TO A COMMON CEILING, IN THE NGA. IN ANY CASE, AN AGREEMENT IN RESPECT OF A CEILING INCLUDING AIR MANPOWER SHOULD BE SO FORMULATED THAT IT WOULD NOT PREJUDICE, OR ALLOW CONTRAVENTION OF NATO OBJECTIONS WITH RESPECT TO GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS.

3. IN A LATER STUDY WHICH EXAMINED THE MILITARY/TECHNICAL IMPLICATION OF INCLUDING AIR MANPOWER IN A COMMON CEILING WITH OPTIONAL AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS(1), THE MBFR WORKING GROUP FOUND, INTER ALIA, THAT IN ANY FIRM PROPOSAL TO THE EAST THE ALLIANCE SHOULD

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03695 01 OF 03 111535Z

SPECIFICALLY DEFINE THE GROUND REDUCTIONS AND LIMIT THE SCALE OF OPTIONAL AIR REDUCTIONS FOR PHASE II. THE STAFF GROUP BELIEVE THAT THIS FINDING, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE WG'S PREVIOUS FINDING THAT AN AGREEMENT IN RESPECT OF A CEILING INCLUDING AIR MANPOWER SHOULD NOT PREJUDICE OR CONTRAVENE NATO OBJECTIVES WITH RESPECT TO GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS, CAN ONLY BE INTERPRETED TO MEAN THAT IF AIR MANPOWER IS INCLUDED IN A COMBINED GROUND/AIR COMMON CEILING, WHETHER AIR MANPOWER IS ADDRESSED WITHOUT REDUCTIONS OR IS INCLUDED FOR OPTIONAL REDUCTIONS, A LIMITATION MUST BE IMPOSED UPON PHASE II RESIDUAL GROUND FORCE LEVELS IN THE NGA.

FOOTNOTE

(1) AC/276-D(75)5

END FOOTNOTE

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03695 02 OF 03 111153Z

41

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 USIE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 ERDA-05

CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 /083 W

----- 014162

O R 111007Z JUL 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2666

RUEKJCSSECDEF WASHDC IMMEIDATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

TUDTC/AMEMBASSY LONDON 5522

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

SECRET SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 3695

4. IF THAT INTERPRETATION IS CORRECT, IT IS CLEAR THAT APPROACHES 2 AND 3, WHICH INCLUDE SUB-CEILINGS ON GROUND MANPOWER, WOULD IMPOSE THE REQUIRED LIMITATION ON PHASE II RESUDUAL GROUND MANPOWER LEVELS. ON THE OTHER HAND, APPROACHES 1 AND 4, WHICH INCLUDE NO SUB-CEILINGS ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER, IMPOSE NO SUCH LIMITATION AND WOULD NOT BE MILITARILY ACCEPTABLE UNLESS SOME TYPE OF MEASURE OR NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE IS INCLUDED IN THE MBFR AGREEMENT WHICH PLACES AT LEAST A DE FACTO SUB-CEILING ON PHASE II RESIDUAL GROUND FORCE LEVELS. IN THAT EVENT, THE EFFECT OF APPROACH1, NO SUB-CEILINGS ON AIR OR GROUND BUT WITH AN APPROPRIATE MEASURE LIMITING PHASE II RESIDUAL GROUND FORCE LEVELS WOULD BE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME AS

THAT OF APPROACH 3, NO SUB-CEILING ON AIR BUT WITH A SUB-CEILING ON GROUND MANPOWER ONLY. SIMILARLY, THE EFFECT OF APPROACH 4 WOULD BE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME AS THAT OF APPROACH 2.

5. FROM THE FOREGOING IT IS CLEAR THAT THE SUB-CEILING ISSUE EVOLVES PRINCIPALLY FROM THE QUESTION OF WHETHER, IN THE EVENT
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03695 02 OF 03 111153Z

THAT AIR MANPOWER IS INCLUDED IN A COMBINED AIR/GROUND COMMON CEILING, A SUB-CEILING, SPECIFIED OR DE FACTO, SHOULD BE IMPOSED ON AIR MANPOWER AS IT MUST BE ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER. THERE IS AN ADDITIONAL ISSUE THAT MUST BE CONSIDERED AND THAT IS THE QUESTION OF HOW TO ESTABLISH THE LEVELS OF THE SUB-CEILING ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER

AND, IF REQUIRED, ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER.

6. SO FAR, THE ALLIANCE HAS PRODUCED ONE PROPOSAL TO RESOLVE BOTH OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS AND THREE POSSIBLE METHODS TO RESOLVE THE LATTER QUESTION. A US NOTE (1) ON 16 JAN, 1975., INDICATES A PREFERENCE FOR SUB-CEILINGS ON BOTH AIR AND GROUND FORCE MANPOWER WHERE THE LEVELS OF THE SUB-CEILINGS COULD BE VARIED AN AGREED AMOUNT. THREE METHODS FOR RESOLVING THE LATTER QUESTION-FIRST, THE

PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION METHOD; SECOND, BY DEFINING IN PERCENTAGE TERMS MAXIMUM OPTIONAL AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS, HAVE BEEN EXAMINED BY THE WORKING GROUP (2); HOWEVER, THE WORKING GROUP HAVE NOT YET EXAMINED ALL THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE US PROPOSAL.

7. THE STAFF GROUP BELIEVE THAT THE QUESTION OF HOW TO ESTABLISH THE LEVELS OF SUB-CEILINGS IS SUBORDINATE TO THE PRINCIPAL QUESTION OF WHETHER TO IMPOSE A SPECIFIED OR DEFACTO SUB-CEILING ON AIR MANPOWER AND THAT FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST METHOD FOR ESTABLISHING SUB-CEILING LEVELS SHOULD BE DEFERRED UNTIL THE PRINCIPAL QUESTION HAS BEEN RESOLVED IN THE ALLIANCE.

BEGIN FOOTNOES:

(1) US NATO /POL/975/NS/75-5(LAST TWO PARAGRAPHS OF SUB-SECTION II.D.2 OF STATE 263866, NOV 30 1974)

(2) AC/276-D(75)5

END FOOTNOTES

8. TO DATE, ALTHOUGH THE WORKING GROUP HAVE EXAMINED THE MILITARY-TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL QUESTION(1) THEY HAVE NOT INDICATED THEIR PREFERENCE AS TO WHICH APPROACH THEY PREFER: APPROACH 2 OR APPROACH 3, OR APPROACH 1 OR 4 CAVEATED BY APPROPRIATE MEASURES TO ENSURE LIMITATION ON PHASE II RESIDUAL GROUND FORCE LEVELS.

WHILE THERE MAY BE POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS WHICH INDICATE THAT

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03695 02 OF 03 111153Z

APPROACHES 1 AND 4, APPROPRIATELY CAVEATED, ARE PREFERABLE TO EITHER APPROACH 2 OR 3, FROM THE MILITARY/TECHNICAL VIEWPOINT THE REVERSE WOULD APPEAR TO BE TRUE: APPROACHES 2 AND 3 ARE CLEAR-OUT AND UNQUIVOCABLE, AND, IF ADOPTED, ARE LIKELY TO EVOKE GREATER CONFIDENCE WITHIN THE ALLIANCE THAT THE SECURITY OF NATO WILL REMAIN UNIMPAIRED THAN, THE ADOPTION OF EITHER OF THE OTHER APPROPRIATELY CAVEATED APPROACHES.

9. THE PROBLEM, THEREFORE, APPEARS FROM THE MILITARY/TECHNICAL VIEWPOINT TO DEVOLVE TO THIS: WHICH IS PREFERABLE, APPROACH 2 OR 3? THE WORKING GROUP HAVE ALREADY FOUND THAT EITHER APPROACH COULD BE ADOPTED WITHOUT ADVERSE MILITARY SECURITY EFFECTS FOR NATO(1). IN COMPARING THE APPROACHES, THE WORKING GROUP FOUND THAT:

BEGIN FOOTNOTE

(1) AC/276-D(74)14

END FOOTNOTES

A. WITH RESPECT TO FORCE ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE
APPROACH 2 COULD RESTRAIN POSSIBLE REORGANIZATION AND RESTRUCTURING OF GROUND AND AIR FORCES, AND TRANSFERS BETWEEN THOSE FORCES, IF INCREASES RESULTING FROM PROPOSALS IN THESE REGARDS COULD NOT BE

ACCOMMODATED WITHIN AGREED SUB-CEILINGS. APPORACH 3 WOULD NOT CONSTRAIN RESTRUCTURING POSSIBILITIES FOR AIR FORCES MADE AT THE EXPENSE OF GROUND FORCE MANPOWER, BUT COULD CONSTRAIN RESTRUCTURING FOR GROUND FORCES.

B. WITH RESPECT TO DEFINITION OF FORCES: IN BOTH APPROACH 2 AND 3 (AS WELL AS 4) IT COULD BE NECESSARY TO DEFINE THE GROUND AND AIR FORCES RESPECTIVELY, IF THE DEFINITION BY UNIFORM IS UNACCEPTABLE.

C. WITH RESPECT TO EXCEPTIONS FOR TRAINING, EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS. THERE MAY BE LESS OF A REQUIREMENT TO DETAIL AND DEFINE THESE EXCEPTIONS FOR APPROACH 3 (AS WELL AS 1 AND 4) THAN FOR APPROACH 2.

D. WITH RESPECT TO VERIFICATION: THE DEGREE TO WHICH ONE APPROACH MIGHT ENTAIL GREATER VERIFICATION PROBLEMS THAN ANOTHER CANNOT

BE PROPERLY ASSESSED UNTIL THE FORM OF A VERIFICATION AND INSPECTION

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03695 02 OF 03 111153Z

IS KNOWN.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03695 03 OF 03 111126Z

20

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 USIE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 /083 W

----- 013937

O R 111007Z JUL 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2667

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 3695

10. ON BALANCE THEN THERE IS LITTLE DIFFERENCE IN THE MILITARY ADVANTAGE OR DISADVANTAGES THAT WOULD ACCRUE TO NATO BY THE

ADOPTION OF ONE OF THESE TWO APPROACHES OVER THE OTHER. UNLESS THERE IS SOME ASPECT OF THE QUESTION WHICH THE WORKING GROUP HAVE FAILED TO CONSIDER IN THEIR PREVIOUS EXAMINATION THAT WOULD CLEARLY TIP THE MILITARY SCALE IN FAVOR OF ONE OF THESE TWO APPROACHES, THE WORKING GROUP WILL BE HARD PRESSED AT THIS TIME TO FIND CONVINCING MILITARY ARGUMENTS FOR THE ADOPTION OF ONE OVER THE OTHER. ON THE OTHER HAND, FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN MBFR COULD BRING TO LIGHT AN ASPECT OF THE PROBLEM WHICH WILL CLEARLY POINT TO THE BEST SOLUTION OR EVEN RENDER THE PROBLEM ACADEMIC. THE POINT IS THAT IT MAY BE SOMEWHAT PREMATURE TO COME TO A DECISION NOW AND THAT IT WOULD BE PRUDENT TO DELAY SUCH A DECISION UNTIL ADDITIONAL RELEVANT MILITARY FACTORS BEARING ON THE DECISION ARE IDENTIFIED AND TABLED IN THE WORKING GROUP.

END TEXT

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03695 03 OF 03 111126Z

6. AT THE JULY 1 SESSION OF THE WG, THE UK REP CIRCULATED THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED REVISIONS FOR SOME OF THE INITIAL PARAGRAPHS OF THE MBFR STAFF GROUP DRAFT. THE UK WISHES TO RETAIN THE FIRST TWO PARAGRAPHS OF THE STAFF GROUP DRAFT. THE UK PARAS 3 THROUGH 7 ARE INTENDED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR PARAS 3, 4 AND 5 OF THE STAFF GROUP DRAFT. PARA 8 RETURNS TO THE STAFF GROUP DRAFT'S PARA 6. THE PROPOSED UK AMENDMENTS FOCUS MORE SPECIFICALLY ON THE US PROPOSAL CONTAINED IN REF B.

7 BEGIN TEXT

AIM

3. THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER IS TO EXAMINE THE TYPE OF MEASURES WHICH COULD BE DEVISED TO COMPLEMENT APPROACHES 1 AND 4 AND THEREBY PREVENT THE WP FROM REINSTATING IN THE NGA THOSE GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS WHICH THEY HAD BEEN REQUIRED TO UNDERTAKE UNDER AN MBFR AGREEMENT.

RECIPROCITY

4. IN OUR EXAMINATION WE HAVE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT THE FACT THAT ANY MEASURES WHICH ARE IMPOSED TO PREVENT CIRCUMVENTION OF REDUCTIONS WILL HAVE TO APPLY AS MUCH TO NATO FORCES REDUCED OR WITHDRAWN FROM THE NGA AS TO WP FORCES. IN THIS CONNECTION WE ARE CONSCIOUS THAT ONE OF NATO'S AIMS IS TO RETAIN AS MUCH FLEXIBILITY TO RE-STRUCTURE ITS OWN FORCES POST-MBFR AS IS APRATICABLE. INDEED, IN THE CONTEXT OF OPTION III, THE US STATED (1), THAT IT WAS LESS IMPORTANT TO THE WEST TO IMPOSE CONTRAINTS ON THE SOVIET'S ABILITY TO RE-STRUCTURE THEIR ARMED FORCES THAN IT WAS TO PRESERVE ITS OWN FLEXIBILITY IN THIS DIRECTION. FURTHERMORE, ON PAGE 8 OF THE PAPER ON THE'ROLE OF AIR MANPOWER IN MBFR' (2) THE US ALSO MADE THE POINT THAT "A THIRD CONCERN IS THAT ALLIED

FLEXIBILITY BE MAXIMISED. MINOR FLUCTUATIONS (BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR) WOULD NOT BE OF CONCERN AND MIGHT NOT BE ENTIRELY VERIFIABLE IN ANY EVENT. FURTHERMORE, SINCE TACTICAL OR TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES OPEN TO ONE SIDE WILL LIKELY BE AVAILABLE TO BOTH, WE MAY NOT WISH TO BIND OURSELVES TO PRECISE DATA AND DEFINITIONS WHICH WOULD ALSO BE DIFFICULT TO NEGOTIATE."

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03695 03 OF 03 111126Z

NOTED:

1. US PAPER OF 11 NUNE 75, PARAGRAPH 28. (STATE 132089, JUNE 75)
2. US NATO/POL/OUT/NS 74-154 OF 2 DEC 74. (STATE 263806 NOV 30, 1974)

U US PROPOSALS

5. IN THEP PAPER ON THE 'ROLE OF THE AIR MANPOWER' (2) THE US LISTED (ON PAGES 6-8) A NUMBER OF WAYS IN WHICH APPROACHES 1 AND 4 COULD BE MODIFIED TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF NATO'S REQUIREMENT THAT WP GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE CIRCUMVENTED WHILE ALLOWING A MEASURE OF FLEXIBILITY TO MIX GROUND AND AIR FORCES POST-MBFR. THESE INCLUDED THE 'LIMITED FREEDOM-TO-MIX' METHOD, THE 'OVERLAPPING SUB-CEILING' METHOD AND 'NON-EXPLICIT SUB-CEILINGS'.

6. IN A SUBSEQUENT PAPER (3) THE US PROPOSED A FURTHER METHOD - THE 'FLEXIBILITY FORMULATION' WHICH WAS PARTIALLY EXAMINED BY THE WG (4).

7. IN THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPHS WE EXAMINE EACH OF THESE METHODS IN TURN.

8. 'LIMITED FREEDOM TO MIX'. (RETURN TO PARA 6 OF MBFR STAFF GROUP DRAFT).

NOTES:

2. US NATO/POL/OUT/NS 74-154 OF 2 DEC 74.(LAST 2 PARAGRAPHS

SUB-SECTION II.B. C STATE 263866 NOV. 30, 1974)

3. US NATO/POL/OUT/NS/75-5 OF 16 JAN 75.

4 AC/276 - D(75)5 OF 11 JUNE 75

END TEXT

8. COMMENT: IN ADDITION TO THE UK REP'S INSISTENCE THAT THE WG RE-OPEN ITS STUDY OF THE SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS IN A COMBINED AIR/MANPOWER CEILING, OTHER UK REPS AND THE FRG REP HAVE REFERRED TO THE NEED FOR SUCH A STUDY IN CONNECTION WITH THE US PROPOSAL IN OPTION III. KNOWING THE UK DESIRE THAT THE WG BE GIVEN A PIECE OF THE ACTION INCLUDING THE STUDY OF OPTION III, WE SUSPECT THEY VIEW THE SUB-CEILINGS ISSUE AS A MINIMAL GESTURE TOWARD SATISFYING THAT DESIRE.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03695 03 OF 03 111126Z

9. AS DEPARTMENT IS AWARE FROM PREVIOUS SPC AND WG CONSIDERATION OF SUB-CEILINGS ISSUE, THE ALLIES WISH TO BE CERTAIN THAT THE FINAL ALLIED POSITION ON SUB-CEILINGS WILL KEEP THE FOCUS OF THE NEGOTIATION ON GROUND FORCES. THIS IS WHY FRG HAS CALLED FOR SUB-CEILING ON GROUND FORCES ONLY, AND WHY THE NETHERLANDS HAS CALLED FOR ANY APPROACH WITH A SUB-CEILING ON GROUND FORCES. SHOULD THE WG PROCEED TO EXAMINE THE US PROPOSAL OF NON-EXPLICIT SUB-CEILINGS ON THE BASIS OF THE UK PAPER, WE BELIEVE AN EARLY ISSUE IS LIKELY TO INVOLVE A MORE PRECISE US DEFINITION OF THE RANGE OF VARIATIONS TO BE ALLOWED BY THE US CONCEPT OF LIMITED FREEDOM TO MIX (REF C). END COMMENT

9. ACTION REQUESTED REQUEST COMMENTS ON MBFR STAFF GROUP DRAFT AND PROPOSED UK REVISIONS OF SUB-CEILINGS PAPER.PEREZ

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 11 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03695
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: USMISSIN NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzkyv.tel
Line Count: 451
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 6794 DTG 051730Z DEC 75 B. STATE 263866, NOV 30, 1974; C. USNATO 0686 DTG 072015Z FEB 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by lzenbel0>; APPROVED <02 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: AIR MANPOWER: SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006